

REMARKS

The formal objections have been corrected.

With respect to the maintenance of the rejection of claim 1 based on Griffin, Griffin plainly does not show a wheel extending through the top and bottom sides of the housing wherein the top and bottom sides are opposed. The only extension in Griffin is at an edge or top side, but not through opposed sides. As shown in Figure 11, the scroll wheel does not extend out of the housing at two places but, instead, has one end which is user accessible and the other end which is buried within the housing.

Therefore, reconsideration of the rejection of claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Claim 7 was rejected based on the design patent. However, the design patent does not teach providing a scroll wheel that extends completely through the top and bottom sides of a housing, nor one that can be manipulated between a user's thumb and forefinger at the same time the housing is held in the user's hand. The fact that a knob extends from the side of the housing does not meet the limitation of a scroll wheel extending through the top and bottom sides of the housing. Moreover, because the wheel does not extend above the top and bottom sides of the housing, it cannot be manipulated between the user's thumb and forefinger at the same time the housing is held. While the knob could be rotated using a thumb and forefinger as noted by the Examiner, it could not be done so by the same hand that is holding the housing. As clearly shown in the reference's figures 4, 5, 6, and 7, the knob does not extend beyond the upper and lower opposed surfaces.

Finally, the assertion that a single reference could reach the claimed invention must fail as a matter of law. There can be no rationale to modify the reference when the reference simply does not teach anything but what is admittedly inadequate to meet the claimed invention. Thus, a single reference rejection is statutorily insufficient. The Examiner's assertion that the wheel clearly "extends completely through the top and bottom sides" is not understood since it does not extend through any side. Moreover, it does not even extend beyond the opposed top and bottom sides as clearly shown in the cited figures. Therefore, the reliance on the design patent is not understood.

In view of these remarks, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 30, 2004



Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994
PROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
8554 Katy Freeway, Ste. 100
Houston, TX 77024
713/468-8880 [Phone]
713/468-8883 [Fax]